

eight, quite useless (or unidentifiable) names. Nothing in the description of either his *Ve. pardalis* or *Ve. brasiliensis* differentiates them from *Vaginulus (Phyllocaulis) langsdorfi* Férussac, while *Ve. gracilis* is apparently an additional synonym for *Vaginulus taunaisii*. I suspect that his *Ve. ribeirensis* may actually be a new species, although it is not, on the basis of its description, distinguishable from *Vaginulus (Angustipes) erinaceus* Colosi. *Ve. rosilla* and *Ve. fuscescens* are nomina dubia. The keeled dorsum of *Ve. carinata* tantalizes one's curiosity, but the rest of its description, without figures, leaves even its generic position in doubt. *Ve. discrepans* is probably a member of the group of *Vaginulus (Angustipes) dubius* Semper. None of these new names are accompanied by descriptions or figures of the female genitalia, which, in my opinion, offer the best characters for the generic determination of American Veronicellidae.

THYASIRA DISJUNCTA GABB not THYASIRA BISECTA Conrad
THE RECENT WEST COAST SHELL

BY NELLIE MAY TEGLAND

Museum of Paleontology, University of California

Thyasira disjuncta described by Gabb¹ from the Pliocene deposits of Deadman Island, near San Pedro Bay, California, was later by Dall,² thrown into synonymy with *Thyasira bisecta* Conrad,³ described from Miocene deposits at Astoria, Oregon, and this determination has been followed by all later workers.

In the course of a study of the Oligocene fauna of the state of Washington, in which epoch the genus *Thyasira*

appears in practically all the horizons, it was found necessary to evaluate the two above named species and the result is the decision that *T. bisecta* has so far been found only in the Miocene at Astoria, and that *T. disjuncta* is a distinct species to which must be referred the recent form found living off the Alaska Peninsula and southward to the coast of Oregon.

Thyasira disjuncta was well figured by Gabb⁴ and, under the name of *T. bisecta*, by Dall⁵, Arnold⁶ and Oldroyd⁷. A comparison of these figures, even without the actual material, with those of *T. bisecta* figured by Conrad⁸ will show the decided difference in the anterior truncation which distinguishes the two species. *T. bisecta* has the anterior margin below the lunule projecting forward while *T. disjuncta* shows this area as distinctly flattened; quoting Gabb, "anterior end abruptly and angularly truncated".

Examination of a large series of individuals from the Tertiary of the West Coast shows other differences such as in outline and size of adult forms, but the outstanding contrast is the feature just described.

The Oligocene species of *Thyasira* is closer to *T. disjuncta* of the Pliocene and recent but there are some small individuals which resemble the Miocene *T. bisecta*. I have in preparation a more complete, illustrated, discussion of these relationships and their interpretation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. *Conchocele disjuncta* Gabb, Pal. Calif., vol. 2, p. 99, pl. 7, figs. 48, 48a, 48b, 1869. (Pliocene, Deadman Island, California.)
2. *Cryptodon bisectus* Dall, Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., vol. 17, pl. 26, figs. 2, 5, 1894. (Recent, off the south coast of the Alaska Peninsula.)
3. *Venus bisecta* Conrad, Wilkes Expl. Exped., vol. 10, p. 724, pl. 17, figs. 10, 10a, 1849. (Miocene, Astoria, Oregon.)
4. Gabb, Op. cit.
5. Dall, Op. cit.
6. *Thyasira bisecta* Arnold, Mem. Calif. Acad. Sci., vol. 3, p. 135, pl. 15, fig. 5, 1903. (Pliocene, Deadman Island, California.)

7. *Thyasira bisecta* Oldroyd, Ida S., Publ. Puget Sound. Biol. Sta. Univ. Wash., vol. 4, p. 37, pl. 6, fig. 1, March, 1824 (Recent off Brown Island, Washington.) ; Stanford Univ. Publ. Geol. Sci., vol. 1, no. 1, p. 120, pl. 10, fig. 1. (Same figure.)
 8. Conrad, Op. cit.
-

THE DATE OF PUBLICATION OF UNIO DOMBEYANA Val.

BY BRYANT WALKER

This species was published by Valenciennes in Humboldt and Bonpland's *Recueil d'Observations &c*, II, p. 227, pl. LIII, figs. 1-1b.

The date of publication is given by Binney (*Bib. Am. Con.*, Pt. II, p. 6) as 1833 and in this he was followed by Simpson both in his *Synopsis* and *Descriptive Catalogue*.

The fact that Valenciennes's paper was referred to by Barnes and Lea in 1828 and 1829 has raised a question as to the correctness of this date in the minds of several American conchologists.

Through the kindly offices of Mr. J. R. leB. Tomlin the question was laid before Mr. C. D. Sherborn, the eminent English bibliographer, with the following result, which definitely settles the matter.

Vol. II of part 2 (*Zool.*) of the *Receuil* down to and including p. 256 was issued in 1827. Beginning with p. 257 (where a new signature commences) it appeared in 1832.

Presumably the volume was completed in 1833 and the title page consequently bears that date. Hence the erroneous quotation by Binney and others.

It follows that Valenciennes' species was published four years prior to Lea's *Unio trapezoides* (1831) and therefore takes precedence over it as the proper specific name.